Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 30, 31, 33-38 have been amended. Claims 1-29 and 53 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 30-52 and 54-73 are present for examination.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Brendel

The Examiner has rejected claims 26-73 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Brendel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,772,333 ("Brendel"). In Brendel, a load balancer uses session IDs to route secure requests back to the server that handled the last secure request from that user. To establish a new SSL session, the load balancer assigns the session to a selected server. The server then establishes the SSL session ID (Col. 10, lines 6 et seq., Col. 11, lines 14 et seq.). The server then informs the load balancer of the session ID that was assigned.

In Claim 39, a secure tunnel is assigned to the assigned server. There is no suggestion in Brendel that the load balancer should assign secure tunnels. Instead, the server would appear to be responsible for selecting and establishing the SSL session. This puts more load on the server and raises the possibility of conflicts between simultaneous secure tunnels at a single server farm. Claim 43 further elaborates on assigning a secure tunnel. Claim 44 further defines elements of a secure tunnel.

The Examiner suggests that a secure tunnel is a designated channel of communications that is encrypted. This suggestion ignores whether the secure tunnel is assigned and tracked at the respective servers as in Brendel or by the dispatcher as recited in the claims of the present invention.

Attorney Docket No. 42P9326
Application No. 09/675,694   12

Claims 46, 57, 60, and 70 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 39 and are believed to be allowable therefore.

Claims 64 and 70 recite a mapping table containing session identifiers linked to server and secure tunnel assignments. There is nothing in Brendel to suggest such a link in a mapping table. In Brendel, the server assignment is linked only to the session ID. Accordingly, these claims are further believed to be allowable over the references.

The remaining claims are dependent upon one of the claims mentioned above and are believed to be allowable therefore as well as for the express limitation set forth in each claim respectively.

Attorney Docket No. 42P9326
Application No. 09/675,694   13

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension. Charge our Deposit Account.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: __11/29/1'1__

Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980

Attorney Docket No. 42P9326
Application No. 09/675,694   14